

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of 12/16/2004.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 2-7, 9-17, 19-24 and new claims 25-27 remain in this application. Claims 1, 8, and 18 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,351,547).

The Claims distinguish over the References of Record

By way of brief review, the present application is directed to a method and device for imaging multiple sets of an electronic document on one or more image-forming devices.

Therefore, there are two broad concepts of the present application. The first is that a use is provided with the ability to generate images of an electronic document on distinct image forming devices (e.g., a copier, fax, printer, etc.). The second concept permits at the same time the user to generate images in different formats on a same image forming device (e.g., a single copier will be provided with formats to print x copies in a color format and y copies in a black and white format).

Applicants have amended **claim 1** to address these concepts. More specifically, **claim 1** has now been amended to emphasize that provided is a method to process an electronic image from an electronic device where a selection is made of property options from image-forming devices to create multiple imaging formats of the electronic image. Thus, this part of the claim shows the concept of a single electronic image being prepared to be imaged by a plurality of image-forming devices.

Next, it is recited that multiple imaging formats are generated of the electronic image on the image-forming devices, in response to the select command. Thus, the electronic image may be sent to a copier, a fax machine, a personal data assistant (PDA), a mobile telephone, a digital camera and other electronic device, and will be presented in an appropriate format, as the appropriate property options have been selected for that particular imaging device. The claim also now recites that at least

one of these image-forming devices will have more than one imaging format (for example, a printer A may be provided with a first imaging format to produce two color copies of the imaging document on 8½ x 11 paper, and a second imaging format to generate three additional copies in black and white on A-4 paper). It also now recited that the imaging will occur automatically without user intervention.

Applicants have reviewed the Johnson patent, and the arguments in the present Office Action. It is respectfully submitted these concepts do not address providing a single imaging device with multiple imaging formats as now claimed. It is submitted Johnson does not, disclose or fairly teach the concept of claim 1. Further, Johnson does not disclose or suggest generating formats for a multiple number of image-forming devices as claimed in claim 1 and as further recited in **claim 4**.

To further distinguish the concepts of the present application from the cited reference, Applicants have added new **claim 25**, wherein the image forming device having multiple formats is described as one of a copier or a printer, and the multiple formats are a color image format and a black-and-white image format.

It is to be appreciated that another distinction is that Johnson requires use of a Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine (DICOM) protocol. Specifically, as stated in column 2, beginning at line 4 of this patent, it is stated,

"To successfully transfer images, the relevant networking features of the ultrasound imager must be compatible with the networking features of the destination remote device . . . The DICOM standards are intended for use in communicating medical digital images among printers, workstations, acquisition modules (such as an ultrasound imaging system) and file servers. The acquisition module is programmed to transfer data in a format which complies with the DICOM standards, while the receiving device is programmed to receive data which has been formatted in compliance with those same DICOM standards."

Thus, both the sending and receiving devices need additional software so they may communicate under this DICOM standard. No such requirement is necessary in the present application. Applicants respectfully submit this is a significant distinction, as the present application is able to work in an existing format as it is programming existing options of a particular imaging device. It is not necessary for the present device to place software onto the receiving device to provide proper communication.

For the reasons recited above, it is submitted independent **claim 1** along with

its dependent **claims 2-7** and new **claim 25** are distinguished from the cited art.

Claim 4 now calls for generating an output image at an image forming device that may include a printer, a copier, a facsimile machine, a personal data assistant (PDA), a mobile telephone and a digital camera. Johnson fails to teach such output versatility. Johnson shows a network with multiple printers (e.g. Fig 2) and labels them “printer 1 – printer m.” It is clear that Johnson does not contemplate output devices beyond printers and storage devices. For example, Johnson, at col. 8 lines 32-35 states that a menu will be filled in with a “printer” or a “storage” entry depending on whether the device being configured is a printer or a storage device. As the field of Johnson is concerned with ultrasound images, it is reasonable to assume that Johnson is limited to only printers, as a diagnostician would want a single copy to view and evaluate with a patient. It is reasonable to assume that Johnson does not contemplate further output devices as mass producing, collating, binding etc. (the functions of a copier) and transmitting documents (the function of a fax) do not seem to align with the medical diagnosis intended from an ultrasound image. Further, it is reasonable to assume that Johnson does not contemplate these additional modalities since they are not explicitly called forth in Johnson. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that **claim 4** distinguishes patentably and unobviously over Johnson.

Claim 11 now calls for an image forming device that may include a printer, a copier, a facsimile machine, a personal data assistant (PDA), a mobile telephone and a digital camera. As previously discussed with respect to claim 4, Johnson fails to contemplate these additional output devices.

Applicants have added new **claim 26** (which depends from claim 11) to further emphasize that a single image-forming device may have a plurality of formats such that more than one depiction of the image in more than one format may be obtained on a single image-forming device.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 11** and **claims 9, 10, 12-17** and **26** dependent therefrom now distinguish patentably and unobviously over Johnson.

Claim 21 now calls for at least two imaging formats to be found on one an image forming device. It is also respectfully submitted that **claim 21** and **claims 19, 22-24** and **27** dependent therefrom now distinguish patentably and unobviously over Johnson.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 2-7, 9-17, and 19-27) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, she is hereby authorized to call Mark Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP



Mark S. Svat
Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

3/2/05

Date

N:\XERZ\200528\VSNO000278V001.DOC